United Nations A/C.3/72/SR.45

General Assembly
Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 January 2018

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 14 November 2017, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Gunnarsson ..... (Iceland)

Contents

Agenda item 71: Rights of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

17-20217 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 71: Rights of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.59)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.59: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

1. **Mr. Moussa** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that 2017 marked 50 years of the Israeli occupation, 100 years since the Balfour Declaration and 70 years since the partition of Palestine by the General Assembly. The people of Palestine suffered daily as a result of the Israeli occupation, the illegal policies and practices of Israel and the denial of their natural and inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination.

2. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Angola, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.25: United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region

3. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

4. **Ms. Al-Temimi** (Qatar), introducing the draft resolution, said that the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region, established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/153, was mandated to undertake training and documentation activities according to international human rights standards and to support such efforts within the region by Governments, United Nations agencies and programmes, national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations. In the draft resolution, the General Assembly recognized the progress made by the Centre in the promotion of human rights and advocacy in the region, the assistance it had provided through human rights capacity-building activities and technical assistance and training programmes, and its commitment to ensuring greater effectiveness and efficiency in the implementation of its mandate.

5. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, El Salvador, Eritrea, Kiribati, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, the Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen had joined the sponsors.

6. **Mr. Qassem Agha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation wished to request a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.25. Once again, the delegation of Qatar had made a fevered attempt to promote a draft resolution whose purpose was to secure funding from the United Nations budget for the Training and Documentation Centre, after Qatar had previously pledged to cover the centre's expenses. That change in position would lead to a burden on the United Nation budget, which had trouble securing funding for its main entities and programmes, and whose dwindling funds should be spent on higher-priority areas. Syria called on Member States to follow up on the activities carried out by the centre since its inception, which did not warrant "appropriate and sustainable funding" from the United Nations budget. While Syria supported the reference in the draft resolution to the role of regional cooperation in promoting and protecting human rights, such regional cooperation no longer existed. The Syrian Government and people faced blatant enmity from States in the region, including Qatar.

7. The Doha-based Centre no longer served regional purposes. Instead, it had been used by the Qatari authorities as a national centre that served that country's particular agenda, supporting non-governmental organizations and opposition parties in other States in the region in order to spread chaos and dissent, destroy societies and interfere in the domestic affairs of other States in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. It was not reasonable for the United Nations to help a country that supported terrorism to cover up its violations of international law by hosting and operating a United Nations human rights centre.

8. **Ms. Al-Temimi** (Qatar) said that the draft resolution reaffirmed the protection and promotion of

human rights in the region through a regional centre that operated under the auspices of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Syrian delegation behaved in an unconstructive manner by insulting Qatar and spreading lies that had nothing to do with the draft resolution. It had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution but had not participated in the discussions on the draft resolution, had not made any suggestions and had shown scant interest in the issue. As the Syrian delegation could find no reasons to attack a United Nations centre that effectively and actively worked to implement human rights objectives it had resorted to attacks on the host country.

9. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that the institutions such as the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region played an important role in building capacity in the field of human rights. Her delegation was grateful to the Centre's host country, Qatar, for its commitment to capacity-building both domestically and regionally.

10. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.25.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Mozambique, Syrian Arab Republic.

11. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.25 was adopted by 178 votes to none, with two abstentions.*

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.40 and A/C.3/72/L.42)

12. **Mr. Perez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that at their seventeenth summit meeting, the heads of State and Government of the Movement had stressed that the Human Rights Council was the United Nations organ responsible for the consideration of human rights situations in all countries, through the universal periodic review mechanism, on the basis of cooperation and constructive dialogue. The selective adoption of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee was a means of exploiting human rights for political purposes and, as such, breached the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity.

13. There was a need to promote coherence between the Committee and the Council with a view to avoiding duplication and overlap. The universal periodic review was the main intergovernmental mechanism for examining human rights issues at the national level in all countries without distinction and was conducted with the full involvement of the country concerned and with

due consideration for its capacity-building needs. As a cooperative mechanism, based on objective and reliable information and interactive dialogue, the review must be conducted in an impartial, transparent, non-selective, constructive, non-confrontational and non-politicized manner. National reports should include details of any unilateral coercive measures applied against other States, together with an assessment of their human rights impact.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.40: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

14. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

15. **Ms. Lind** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, introduced the draft resolution. The human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was overshadowed by headline-grabbing reports of nuclear missiles, yet serious human rights violations continued to be committed in a widespread and systematic manner, with no regard for international law. She acknowledged the steps taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the field of human rights, such as its decision to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and to allow the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities to visit the country. However, it was regrettable that the recommendations contained in the reports of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review and the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had yet to be implemented and that visits by other special procedures mandate holders continued to be blocked.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Georgia, Honduras, Israel, Maldives, Mexico, New Zealand, Palau, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Solomon Islands and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the list of sponsors.

17. **Mr. Ja** Song Nam (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation categorically rejected the draft resolution, which was a product of the political and military confrontation of the United States of America and other hostile forces against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and an extreme manifestation of politicization, selectivity and double standards in human rights.

18. The manoeuvres of the United States to sanction and stifle the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had reached an extremely vicious phase. Under the pretext of the implementation of the sanctions resolutions, an indiscriminate blockade was being imposed on his country, preventing the delivery of medical equipment and medicine, creating obstacles to the production of educational equipment and nutritious food for children, and causing most of the assistance activities of international humanitarian organizations to be set back or reduced. The United States sanctions were a despicable violation of human rights. Furthermore, the European Union, Japan and South Korea were not qualified to deliberate over the human rights issues in other countries given their high record of crimes against humanity.

19. Despite the persistent sanctions imposed by the United States and other hostile forces, his Government concentrated all its efforts on improving the livelihood of its people and providing them with a better future. It hoped for sincere dialogue and cooperation in the international human rights field, but would respond strongly to end the confrontation and pressure aimed at stifling its system. It neither recognized nor accepted the resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the Third Committee against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. If the draft resolution was adopted, it would be clear that it could not be considered adopted by consensus.

20. **Mr. Bessho** (Japan) said that the human rights and humanitarian situations remained grave in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Despite the needs of the people and successive Security Council resolutions, the authorities in the country continued to divert resources into pursuing nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles over the welfare of its people. Such a decision in itself constituted a serious human rights violation, and the draft resolution contained firm language on that issue.

21. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had abducted Japanese citizens, including a 13-year-old girl, from Japanese soil. Many years had passed since the abductions had been committed, and the issue could afford no further delay. Japan demanded the immediate return of all abductees.

22. His country urged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to heed the strong message of the international community embodied in the draft resolution and take concrete steps towards resolving outstanding issues of serious human rights violations.

23. **Mr. Qassem Agha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation reaffirmed its rejection of the politicization of the work of the Committee and of the selective and biased approach to human rights situations that undermined constructive dialogue and sowed the

seeds of discord among States. Moreover, the Syrian delegation reaffirmed its categorical rejection of the draft resolution as politically-motivated and reliant on unreliable and unverified information. Its aim was to politicize the issue of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by blatantly interfering in domestic affairs and pursuing sinister agendas at the behest of countries with colonialist designs. Syria rejected any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. The sponsors of the resolution should engage in direct dialogue with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and strive for peaceful coexistence if they wished to strengthen peace and security in the region.

24. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.40 was adopted.*

25. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her country did not agree with country-specific resolutions, as they were highly selective in nature, driven by political rather than human rights considerations, inherently divisive and counterproductive. Such resolutions should be taken up under the universal periodic review. Her delegation would abstain from voting on all country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee. Its abstention should not be interpreted as taking a position on the substance of the human rights issues raised in any of the resolutions. Singapore called upon all Member States, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to implement all Security Council resolutions.

26. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the continuation of the practice of the selective adoption of country-specific resolutions, in particular in the Third Committee, and the exploitation of that platform for political aims contravened the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues and undermined cooperation and dialogue as the essential principles for the promotion and protection of human rights. The universal periodic review provided a mechanism for addressing human rights on an equal basis without recrimination or naming and shaming. His delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Yao** Shaojun (China) said that his Government had consistently advocated for disagreements to be resolved through constructive dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect. China opposed the politicization of human rights issues, the pressuring of countries on human rights issues, and country-specific human rights resolutions. His delegation hoped that the actions of the international community would facilitate peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and not exacerbate tensions. For those reasons,the delegation of China would not join the consensus on the draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.40.

28. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) said that her delegation had repeatedly opposed selective, unilateral resolutions on the human rights situations in individual countries. Such a way of working was ineffective and served only to increase confrontation among States. The United Nations already had a platform for examining the human rights situations in all countries, namely, the universal periodic review, which provided opportunities for establishing constructive and mutually respectful dialogue in the area of human rights. Her delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

29. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that those countries condemned the long-standing and ongoing systematic violations of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. While noting the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, they urged the Government to expedite the enforcement of implementing legislation. Following the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which was an important step towards cooperation between the country and the United Nations, such cooperation should be extended to other United Nations special procedures and human rights mechanisms, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In the light of the findings of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should ensure the welfare and inherent dignity of its people, as called for by the Security Council in its relevant resolutions.

30. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus) said that her delegation had always opposed the consideration of country-specific topics at the United Nations, as they undermined the principles of objectivity and increased confrontation. Country-specific resolutions were of no use and served only to create artificial barriers to equal and constructive dialogue between interested sides. The United Nations already had a mechanism for monitoring the human rights situation in all countries, namely, the universal periodic review. Belarus disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

31. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), reiterating his delegation's principled position against country-specific resolutions, said that

the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela rejected selective and politicized approaches to human rights issues. Such issues should be addressed through cooperation and dialogue. Stressing the importance of the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity, he said that the universal periodic review was the main mechanism for examining human rights issues. Accordingly, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated itself from resolution A/C.3/72/L.40.

32. **Ms. Leon** (Costa Rica) said that her delegation would support the country-specific resolutions because her Government was concerned about the human rights situation in those countries. However, human rights issues should be assessed on their own merits, taking into account the efforts made by the State concerned to improve the human rights situation. The Human Rights Council was the main body responsible for examining human rights issues, through the universal periodic review, which was based on transparent, reliable and objective information. Country-specific resolutions should be confined to the Human Rights Council. Accordingly, Costa Rica would not sponsor any of the country-specific resolutions.

33. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that his delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution in accordance with its opposition to the imposition of selective, politically motivated resolutions and mandates. Genuine international cooperation, based on the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity, was the only way to effectively promote and protect human rights. The universal periodic review mechanism should be given an opportunity to foster debate without politicization or confrontation and encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned. The draft resolution continued to pursue sanctions and the dangerous, counterproductive involvement of the Security Council on matters beyond its mandate. Cuba could not be complicit in attempts to deny the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development. Its opposition to the selective and politicized mandate did not imply any value judgement concerning the pending issues referred to in preambular paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, which called for a just and honourable solution with the agreement of all interested parties.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.41: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

34. **The Chair**, on behalf of the Committee, expressed sympathy on the loss of life in the recent earthquake in Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

35. He said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

36. **Ms. Cranfield** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, noted that, while some positive developments in the human rights record of the Islamic Republic of Iran had been acknowledged in the draft resolution, the scope and gravity of human rights violations in the country unfortunately remained high, and the draft resolution was therefore necessary. Canada had circulated the text to all Member States and engaged in open discussions with all interested delegations. It hoped that, through the draft resolution, the international community could continue to express its desire to see the Islamic Republic of Iran live up to its international human rights obligations, and that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran would engage constructively at all levels with the international community and all parties involved to address the human rights concerns raised in the draft resolution.

37. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had joined the sponsors: Andorra, Honduras, Palau, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

38. **Mr. Al Habib** (Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed his sympathy to the victims of the earthquake and thanked all those who had offered their condolences and support.

39. Year after year, the time and resources of the Committee were consumed in vain on a draft resolution that solely reflected non-objectivity and selectivity on the part of its sponsors. Canada should have realized that such a pointless and futile exercise was a disservice to the human rights cause.

40. Along with very few others, Canada had consistently and unconditionally supported Israel, despite all the gross, abhorrent and systematic human rights violations committed by that regime. Credible international sources had exposed many cases of non-compliance of Canada with its international human rights obligations, resulting in systematic discriminatory policies against indigenous people, migrants and minorities. While police brutality, forced disappearances and the murder of indigenous people were well documented, indigenous women and girls continued to suffer from institutionalized discrimination and violence.

41. Inconsistency, double standards and discriminatory approaches were integral to the foreign policy of countries such as Canada. In the fight against terrorism, those self-proclaimed champions of human rights

conveniently employed or actively supported good terrorists, who committed blatant violations of human rights to destabilize unfavourable or so-called "rogue" States. For countries such as Canada and the United States, respect for human rights, the promotion of democracy and the fight against terrorism were all ideological mystifications and part and parcel of the system of domination. Some of the countries that adamantly pushed for the biased draft resolution were foolhardy enough to claim that their foreign policy was founded in fundamental freedoms, yet they used their freedom to rob resources from other countries, install military dictatorships, institutionalize torture, promote hate and racism, legitimize foreign occupation, adopt regime change policies, impose coercive unilateral measures and uproot indigenous populations.

42. In its long history, Iran had never practised slavery, colonized other nations, uprooted indigenous communities or advocated racial supremacy. It was absurd that countries that had supported those dark practices and worse in their very short histories had the audacity to abuse the noble cause of human rights to advance their short-sighted political interests.

43. Canada insisted on the futile draft resolution notwithstanding the fact that Israel, the last apartheid regime of the world, was a constant sponsor thereof and that the relevant report of the Secretary-General was not yet available, and regardless of the numerous calls of Iran for respectful dialogue.

44. The commitment of Iran to the promotion and protection of human rights was genuine and deeply rooted in its culture and history. During the past four decades, the people had expressed their voices peacefully and meaningfully through ballot boxes. In May 2017, they had once again freely and peacefully decided their future in the democratically held presidential elections. The attachment of Iranians to democracy and human rights was incontestable. Similar to any other country, deficiencies might exist, and Iran was determined to address them, but it was not for those who had historically supported colonialism, slavery and racism and apartheid to lecture Iranians on human rights.

45. The situation of human rights in Iran by no means warranted a special mandate. Iran cooperated with human rights mechanisms and within the Human Rights Council and had accepted a high number of visits by special mandate holders. The visit of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights was pending owing to administrative arrangements. Iran had regularly and consistently responded to communications from special mandate holders, accepted about 65 per cent of the recommendations received during the second review cycle and, in 2017, voluntarily submitted its universal periodic review mid-term report to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

46. Voting against the absurd draft resolution would be considered a step towards enhancing the credibility of the human rights discourse.

47. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) said that the draft resolution elucidated Iranian human rights violations, including those mentioned in the 31 October 2017 report of the Secretary-General and the 14 August 2017 report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The killings, torture and persecution of minorities did not stop at the Iranian borders but rather extended to anywhere the Iranian Revolutionary Guard was present, such as Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. The Iranian authorities followed a clearly sectarian approach, emptying towns and neighbourhoods of their inhabitants and replacing them with people from other sects, altering the demographic status quo that had prevailed for hundreds of years.

48. Iran had also committed grave violations of the rights of the Ahwazi Arabs. Laws had been enacted expelling them from their homes northeast of the Arabian Gulf in order to change the demographic composition of the area. In 2016, the Iranian Supreme National Security Council had approved a plan advanced by the leadership of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard to expel one third of the Ahwazi Arabs. The Iranian authorities had also diverted the course of rivers away from Ahwazi regions and had continued to block the establishment of Arab cultural centres.

49. The international community must not forget the 1988 executions carried out by the Iranian regime, which killed 30,000 Iranian prisoners. The families of the victims were still waiting for justice. For those reasons, Saudi Arabia supported the draft resolution.

50. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation rejected the draft resolution in its entirety, as it was politicized and sought to damage the reputation of Iran internationally and distort the democratic achievements of the country, which was suffering from unilateral, coercive economic measures that had been imposed by the same States that had submitted the draft resolution. The draft resolution was not within the purview of the Committee, and tabling it undermined the credibility of the Committee and the international political and legal framework, particularly the

agreement that human rights issues should be addressed through the universal periodic review.

51. Why had the issue been raised once again in the Committee and why had accusatory fingers been pointed at countries that had their own human rights cultures and traditions? It was because the draft resolution was full of fabricated intelligence reports from countries that sought to destabilize Iran and sow sectarian and ethnic discord. Rather than focusing on human rights in Iran, draft resolutions should have addressed the state of human rights in States that claimed to care about human rights but had destroyed Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Yemen, had interfered in the internal affairs of Bahrain and had sought desperately to destroy Syria.

52. The mention of Syria in the statement of the Saudi representative was objectionable. He should consult with the Syrian delegation before mentioning the country; otherwise, the Syrian delegation would respond using the force of law.

53. **Ms. Gonzalez Tolosa** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, noted her delegation's principled position against country-specific resolutions and special procedures. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.41. Her delegation rejected selective and politicized approaches to human rights issues, which violated the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Country-specific resolutions, which were not part of the Committee's remit, violated the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity. Instead, human rights issues should be addressed through cooperation and dialogue. The universal periodic review was the appropriate mechanism for examining human rights issues. She called for an end to the adoption by the Committee of country-specific resolutions, which undermined the role of the Human Rights Council.

54. **Mr. Viktorov** (Russian Federation) said that it was counterproductive to adopt politicized country-specific resolutions whose sole goal was to punish Governments which had fallen out of favour. Instead of trying to isolate States, the international community should involve them in equal and mutually respectful dialogue on the full range of human rights issues. Human rights situations had never been improved by adopting a patronizing attitude to another Member State, while casting aspersions on them for political reasons discredited United Nations bodies which, under the Charter of the United Nations, were supposed to respect the sovereign equality of Member States. The Russian delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

55. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus) said that her country had always opposed country-specific mandates, which undermined objectivity, increased confrontation and created artificial barriers to equitable and constructive dialogue. The universal periodic review had proven to be the most suitable instrument for analysing a country's human rights situation in a balanced way and encouraging its Government to resolve existing problems. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that his country would vote against the draft resolution. Cuba maintained a principled position against country-specific resolutions, which encouraged a punitive and confrontational approach to the issue of human rights. The continued inclusion in the agenda of the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran was politically motivated and did not stem from genuine concern or interest in cooperating with that country. Any mandate imposed on the basis of politicization and double standards was destined to fail. His delegation objected to the manipulation of human rights to advance a political agenda, to discredit Governments and to attempt to justify strategies aimed at destabilizing some of those Governments. He called on States to promote respectful and constructive dialogue with the Islamic Republic of Iran based on collaboration and the exchange of good practices.

57. **Mr. Ali** (Pakistan) said that Member States could fulfil their shared responsibility to promote human rights only through a constructive, cooperative and inclusive approach. The Iranian Government had demonstrated its positive engagement to international human rights mechanisms by cooperating with the universal periodic review process and all treaty bodies to which it was party. The recent conduct of free, fair and impartial presidential elections in Iran was further evidence of the country's commitment to the democratic process. The United Nations should endeavour to prevent the duplication of work between the Third Committee and the universal periodic review by ensuring that the latter was the main intergovernmental mechanism for reviewing national human rights situations. Pakistan would vote against the draft resolution.

58. **Mr. Ri** Song Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his country had always maintained a principled position against confrontational and divisive country-specific resolutions, which did not promote and protect human rights, but increased confrontation. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was opposed to all politically-motivated uses of human rights as a pretext to interfere in countries' internal affairs. By

contrast, the universal periodic review process ensured that the human rights situations of all countries were considered on an equal basis. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, States had the sovereign right to maintain their own political and economic systems. For those reasons, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would vote against the draft resolution.

59. **Mr. Yao** Shaojun (China) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.41. The international community should take a comprehensive and objective view of the progress achieved and the challenges facing Iran, and should engage in constructive dialogue and cooperation with that country, instead of making blind accusations and imposing pressure through country-specific human rights resolutions.

60. *At the request of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.41.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen.

Against:

Afghanistan, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

61. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.41 was adopted by 83 votes to 30, with 68 abstentions.*

62. **Mr. Sandoval Mendiolea** (Mexico) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote on the draft resolution. Reports by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Secretary-General indicated that Iran had made advances in its human rights situation, such as by adopting the Charter on Citizens' Rights. Mexico urged Iran to implement the Charter, to step up its cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms, particularly in order to implement the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur, and to report on any progress made in that regard.

63. His delegation was, however, concerned by the increasing application of the death penalty, which Mexico unequivocally opposed in all countries; the lack of effective protection for the rights of minorities; the absence of guarantees for the effective exercise of the freedom of expression and association; and the barriers to full and genuine gender equality. In the past two years, Mexico had abstained from voting on the draft resolution in recognition of the advances and increasing commitment of the Iranian Government to undertake human rights reforms. It was, however, worrying that the good intentions expressed by the Iranian authorities had not resulted in specific and substantive improvements for the population. He hoped that the Anti-Narcotics Law would lead to fewer death sentences and more commutations of sentences, in line with commitments made after the Special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem.

64. **Mr. Saito** (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. In July 2017, Japan and Iran had held their twelfth human rights dialogue, at which discussions had focused on initiatives to improve the human rights situation in Iran, including by empowering women and stepping up cooperation with the international community. Although Iran still faced challenges, especially with regard to freedom of expression in online and offline media, it had made a number of positive steps, such as accepting a visit by foreign ambassadors to Evin Prison, enacting a law to review the death penalty for drug offenders and discussing in parliament the possibility of prohibiting child marriage. Japan encouraged Iran to further improve its human rights situation by continuing to implement recommendations made during the universal periodic review.

65. **Mr. De Souza Monteiro** (Brazil) said that his delegation welcomed the Iranian Government's renewed commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and hoped that President Rouhani would be able to push forward implementation of the Charter on Citizens' Rights, especially with regard to efforts to raise the status of women. His delegation was, however, concerned about allegations of human rights violations. Iran should endeavour, on the basis of international human rights standards, to increase its protection of human rights, especially those of women and of ethnic and religious minorities not recognized by the Iranian Government, such as the Baha'is. Iran should also reconsider its policy regarding the application of capital punishment and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, not least among juvenile offenders.

66. Brazil had abstained from voting on the draft resolution in the belief that a more constructive approach should be adopted by the international community and by Iran, ideally one that was less politicized and that contributed to boosting engagement between the Iranian authorities and human rights bodies.

67. **Mr. Barros Melet** (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote on the draft resolution, even though it supported the proposal for Islamic Republic of Iran to take concrete action to address its human rights issues. Chile recognized the advances made by Iran to strengthen the enjoyment of fundamental human rights, deepen democratic reforms and welcome refugees, but remained concerned by the human rights situation. He urged the Iranian Government to continue cooperating with mechanisms of the universal human rights system in a broad and effective manner; accept and implement the recommendations of the universal periodic review, many of which it had rejected in 2015; ensure due process in the application of the death penalty, which should be used only for the most serious crimes and never for minors; guarantee freedom of expression, opinion, assembly and association; ensure legitimate respect for human rights advocates, journalists and members of the opposition; protect minorities from discrimination and persecution; empower women and vulnerable groups; and welcome special procedures mandate holders, especially the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Iran currently had a good opportunity to improve international cooperation and Chile was prepared to help in that regard.

68. **Mr. García Paz y Miño** (Ecuador) said that country-specific resolutions did not contribute to solving the complicated human rights situation in Member States, but, on the contrary, undermined sovereignty, hindered cooperation and weakened United Nations human rights bodies. The universal periodic review should be strengthened as it was the most appropriate instrument for assessing the human rights situations in all Member States according to the same criteria, in an impartial, objective and ethical manner. His delegation objected to the continued and selective harassment of Member States, particularly developing countries, and had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution, as it would do on all subsequent country-specific draft resolutions.

69. **Mr. Al Habib** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that some Member States were so focused on the human rights situations in other States that they had failed to notice the violations being perpetrated in their own country. The statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia demonstrated how debased considerations of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee had become. Saudi Arabia had killed more children in Yemen than Al-Qaida, Nusrah Front and Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) combined had killed worldwide. It spent billions on buying arms and yet public relations corporations could not conceal the truth that Saudi money fuelled sectarianism in the Persian Gulf, the Middle East and the world. The similarities between the atrocities committed by Saudi Arabia and ISIL, such as beheadings, were not accidental; they were rooted in a common ideology and world view that considered other Muslims and non-Muslims as infidels and heretics. There were clear signs that something was seriously wrong in Saudi Arabia: thousands of children had been murdered by terrorists funded, dispatched and ideologically nurtured by Saudi operatives; the human rights of minorities in Saudi Arabia were systematically violated; a genocide was currently being covertly perpetrated in the eastern Saudi city of Al-Awwamiyah;

those who dared to criticize the royal family were ruthlessly silenced; hundreds of thousands of women, girls and migrant workers were forced to live in abject conditions of slavery; and large numbers of Saudi nationals had joined major terrorist organizations. The status of Saudi Arabia as a partner in the fight again global terrorism and intolerance was also a blatant mockery of humanity, human rights, justice and peace. Saudi Arabia should stop its abuse of international human rights forums.

70. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) said that it seemed he had upset the Iranian delegation when he had discussed the Sunni Ahwazi Arabs. In his response, the representative of Iran had not mentioned any of the countries that had voted in favour of the resolution except Saudi Arabia, because Saudi Arabia had criticized Iranian offenses against the spirit and letter of Islam. The Iranian delegation had brought up irrelevant issues that had nothing to do with the human rights situation in Iran. The members of the Iranian delegation should address their own behaviour before turning their attention to others, and they should know that Saudi Arabia would not allow Iran to throw darts at it when Iran was the subject of the discussion.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.42: Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine

71. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

72. **Mr. Kyslytsya** (Ukraine) said that the situation in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol had continued to deteriorate. The Russian Federation had persisted in blatantly violating its obligations as an occupying Power and had refused to comply with General Assembly resolution 71/205. Murder, torture, harassment, illegal detention and enforced disappearances of journalists and human rights defenders were among the most widespread human rights violations in occupied Crimea. People lived in fear of being accused of being extremists, terrorists or spies and being thrown in jail. It was evident from the case of Olexandr Kolchenko, as well as dozens of others, that fair trials and presumption of innocence were not guaranteed.

73. The occupying authorities not only persecuted individuals, but also suppressed the activities of the Mejlis, the legitimate organ of the Crimean Tatars. Its members had been subject to intimidation, expulsion and incarceration, which had had a detrimental effect on the political and civil rights of the Tatar community. Furthermore, they were at risk of arrest as a result of their involvement with "extremist" organizations.

74. The international community was responsible for ensuring fundamental human rights and freedoms. Despite Russian occupation and the imposition of Russian law, the residents of Crimea were Ukrainian citizens and the Government of Ukraine was therefore committed to protecting their fundamental human rights and freedoms. The draft resolution was a diplomatic, political and legal mechanism through which Ukraine carried out that obligation. The language of the text was based on existing United Nations documents, such as the report of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (Ukraine). It should be noted that the draft resolution was not country-specific, as it was exclusively focused on the situation in Ukraine.

75. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Haiti, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Palau and Romania had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

76. **Mr. Mikayilli** (Azerbaijan) said that Azerbaijan condemned extremism, radicalism and separatism in all their forms and manifestations and the acquisition of territories by the use of force. His delegation reaffirmed its full support for the sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, as set out in General Assembly resolution 68/262 on the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Political dialogue should be used to settle all conflicts between Member States, in accordance with international law.

77. **Mr. Viktorov** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution was the latest attempt by Ukraine to use the topic of the promotion and protection of human rights to advance its own political aims and was even more divorced from reality than in the previous year. It represented yet another desperate attempt to change the status of Crimea even though the people of Crimea had clearly expressed their will in the 2014 referendum. The sponsors of the draft resolution were stubbornly trying to depict the situation in Crimea as an armed conflict, not least in their totally unsuitable use of terminology from international humanitarian law, probably in a bid to create some kind of legal justification for military provocations. Those who supported the draft resolution were encouraging the dangerous fantasies of Ukraine and were therefore partly responsible for any consequences. He emphasized that there was no armed conflict in Crimea and that Crimea and the city of

Sevastopol were Russian regions whose positive and peaceful development should not be impeded.

78. The views of Ukraine, couched in language related to human rights, did not fall within the mandate of the Third Committee and discredited its work. Ukraine was trying to paint a false picture of the human rights situation in Russian Crimea in order to divert attention from the many human rights abuses which it was committing, including torture, enforced disappearances, discrimination on ethnic, linguistic and religious grounds, political persecution and violations of the freedom of expression. Although the human rights situation in Crimea had regularly been criticized by various international organizations, it was not until 2014 that the self-proclaimed defenders of the human rights of the people of Crimea reacted.

79. The proposal in the draft resolution to approve the actions of Ukraine with regard to Crimea was cynical in the extreme, especially since the sponsors had failed to mention that such actions included blockades on water, transport, trade and energy, attempted sabotage and restrictions of movement on the basis of discrimination. The draft resolution had even implied that violations of the freedom of expression, the use of censorship and the harassment of journalists facilitated access to objective information.

80. It was regrettable that the actions taken by the Ukrainian authorities were supported by the United States, European Union countries and Canada, which had imposed sanctions to limit trade and investment cooperation with that Russian region. The visa restrictions imposed on the people of Crimea by the European Union were flagrant human rights violations that impeded the freedom of movement.

81. The demand by Ukraine to ensure the availability of education in the languages of ethnic minorities was an outright affront, especially given that Ukraine had adopted a scandalous law in September 2017 which deprived hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of children of the chance to be taught in their native tongue. Meanwhile in Crimea, some schools, courses and textbooks were in the Crimean Tatar language, and it was possible to study in Ukrainian or in many other minority languages.

82. The sponsors of the draft resolution appeared not to worry about religious communities in Crimea, since the draft resolution contained no mention of the ongoing mosque construction in Simferopol. In addition, between 2014 and 2016, the Ukrainian authorities had condoned the seizure of over 40 churches of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which had been subjected to numerous discriminatory measures.

83. Even though his delegation had made its attitude to the previous year's resolution (A/RES/71/205) only too clear, examples of hypocrisy, double standards and disinformation abounded. It seemed that the Ukrainian delegation and its foreign sponsors never had any interest in receiving visits by international experts and had therefore drafted the new resolution as another anti-Russian manifesto. If they genuinely wished to discuss human rights matters, such a heavy-handed approach was not the way forward. The report which the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) had cobbled together despite its absence from the country indicated that the Office had been informed of the Russian position that the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine did not have a mandate to examine the overall situation in Crimea and Russia and that the conduct of any OHCHR mission must be agreed upon directly with the Russian authorities. That report reflected the situation in Crimea no better than a distorted mirror. The discussion of monitoring and access was not presented in the interest of the people of Crimea, but as part of an anti-Russian smear campaign to punish the Crimean people for freely voting to be part of Russia.

84. By supporting the draft resolution, Member States were sending a false signal to Ukraine that it could continue to pursue its policy of discrimination and human rights violations and that the Ukrainian Government was not responsible for the blockade and attempted sabotage in Russian Crimea. He therefore called for a vote on the draft resolution, in the hope that delegations would be able to look at the document objectively, despite the pressure they were under from sponsors of the draft resolution.

85. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation categorically rejected the draft resolution as politically motivated and detached from reality. Syria reiterated its principled rejection of politically-motivated and selective country-specific resolutions. It was regrettable that the Committee was again wasting time discussing propaganda instead of holding a substantive dialogue on the promotion and protection of human rights. Russian Crimea was the target of a group of States which had taken the liberty of judging what was best for another country's inhabitants. The draft resolution did not reflect the real state of affairs in Crimea, nor the opinion and interests of its inhabitants, and was a blatant attempt at interfering in the domestic affairs of the Russian Federation. The fundamental content of the draft resolution was not within the mandate of the Third Committee, and was a prime example of how Member States drafting country-

specific resolutions turned human rights into a political plaything, further discrediting the Third Committee.

86. The continued reliance on country-specific resolutions violated the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity, which had all been agreed upon when the United Nations Commission on Human Rights had been replaced by the United Nations Human Rights Council. However, some pretended not to understand the reason for that replacement and persisted in politicizing human rights issues. Such issues must be addressed during the universal periodic review and not in the Third Committee, as agreed by Governments in 2006.

87. **Ms. Pritchard** (Canada), speaking in explanation of the vote before the voting, said that despite repeated calls by the international community for the Russian authorities to address the human rights situation in Crimea, there had been no marked improvement over the preceding year. Her delegation was particularly concerned about reports of limitations on freedom of expression and association, extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention and torture. It was also concerned about reports of sexual and gender-based violence, harassment of journalists and human rights defenders and discrimination against ethnic minorities such as the Crimean Tatar community. Canada supported the call in the draft resolution for human rights monitoring bodies to have access to the territory. For those reasons, Canada would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

88. **Mr. Grout-smith** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution. The report on Crimea and Sevastopol released by OHCHR in September 2017 laid bare the degradation of human rights standards in the peninsula since its illegal annexation by the Russia Federation in 2014. The declining standards described in the report had made the primary aim of the draft resolution to draw attention to threats to the human rights of those living on the peninsula and offer them protection through greater scrutiny. The United Kingdom urged Russia and the de facto authorities to adhere to the recommendations in the report, as well as the provisions of the draft resolution, beginning with granting OHCHR access to Crimea. It was deplorable that the de facto authorities continued to prevent an independent assessment of the human rights situation by systematically denying access to all international monitoring organizations, not least the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine, which had been active in Ukraine for two years. A second goal of the draft resolution was to restore access to the Crimean peninsula for international human rights monitoring bodies.

89. The United Kingdom was also concerned by the persecution of the Crimean Tatar minority, including the arrest and persecution of the leaders of the Crimean Tatar Mejlis. While his delegation welcomed the release of two Crimean Tatar leaders, it called on the Russian Federation to release the many Ukrainians who remained in prison for speaking out against the illegal annexation of Crimea.

90. **Ms. Gonzalez Tolosa** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, reiterated her delegation's principled position against country-specific resolutions and special procedures. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela categorically rejected the politicization of human rights issues, which violated the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. She called for an end to the adoption of country-specific resolutions by the Committee, which did not fall within its remit and which undermined human rights mechanisms. Accordingly, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.42.

91. **Mr. Ri** Song Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that country-specific resolutions were politicized, an insult to the countries in question and contrary to the guiding principles of non-politicization and non-selectivity. They served as a tool for interfering in the internal affairs of States, and were not conducive to a favourable atmosphere for dialogue and cooperation on human rights issues. The universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council was the appropriate mechanism for considering the human rights situations of all countries on an equal and impartial footing. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea categorically rejected the draft resolution and would vote against it.

92. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the recriminations and naming-and-shaming approach regularly seen in such country-specific resolutions destroyed the atmosphere of dialogue, understanding, mutual respect and cooperation. The persistent adoption of country-specific resolutions and the exploitation of the Committee for political ends contravened the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues. For those reasons, the Islamic Republic of Iran would vote against the draft resolution.

93. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus) said that her country maintained its principled position that it was unacceptable to politicize the human rights agenda.

Belarus had always opposed country-specific mandates, which increased confrontation, drove States apart and created artificial barriers to equitable and constructive dialogue. Moreover, a country-specific resolution could not help to tackle human rights issues in a country in which the Government did not recognize the mandate and refused to cooperate from the outset. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

94. **Mr. Yao** Shaojun (China) said that the draft resolution went beyond the scope of responsibility of the Third Committee. Therefore his delegation would vote against it.

95. **Mr. Ali** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the promotion of human rights was a shared responsibility that could only be achieved through cooperation and inclusion rather than politicization and selectivity. More coherence between the work of the Third Committee and that of the Human Rights Council was needed in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. Pakistan emphasized that the universal periodic review was the main intergovernmental mechanism for examining national human rights issues. Pakistan would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

96. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.42.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen.

Against:

Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Philippines, Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia.

97. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.42 was adopted by 71 votes to 25, with 77 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.